the matters set forth in this declaration, and if called upon to do so, I would and could so testify.

- 2. The point-of-origin stamping policy prevents SHU inmates' two methods of circumventing the prohibition on inmate-to-inmate communications: (1) addressing correspondence to fictitious destinations, and placing another inmate's address as the return address for the bounced mailing; and (2) using intermediaries outside of prison to re-route all or parts of mail to other inmates.
- 3. The place-of-origin stamp is intentionally placed diagonally atop correspondence, which enables correctional officers checking incoming inmate mail to easily note if any part of a correspondence illicitly originated from an inmate at PBSP SHU. These stamps therefore effectively encumber intermediaries who would photocopy and forward the pages back into prison.
- 4. Not only every page of the correspondence, but the envelope itself, receives this place-of-origin stamp. This helps to prevent bouncing mail to another inmate's return address by assuring that the proper return address is placed on the envelope. Correctional officers are often overwhelmed with multiple duties and concerns when being handed mail from an inmate, and can easily overlook discrepancies in the inmate's return address.

The point-of-origin stamping policy protects prison security and the lives of correctional officers and other inmates by putting a stop to methods of prohibited prison-gang communications, while still enabling SHU inmates to send perfectly legible mail. Because over 95% of SHU inmates are prison-gang participants, all outgoing inmate mail from PBSP SHU is stamped to streamline the duties of correctional officers and maintains equal treatment of all SHU inmates which—were it otherwise—could arouse suspicions and jealousies among inmates in the SHU.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Crescent City, California.

Date

20122282 will S#2008400483

Suppl. Decl. McGuyer Supp. Defs.' Mot. Summ. J.

Martinez v. Tilton, et al C 07-4684 CRB (PR)